



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,334	03/01/2004	Gi Youl Kim	40004551-0025-002	2408
26263	7590	12/01/2010	EXAMINER	
SNR DENTON US LLP			TUROCY, DAVID P	
P.O. BOX 061080				
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1715	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/791,334	Applicant(s) KIM ET AL.
	Examiner DAVID TUROCY	Art Unit 1715

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2010.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,11,15,17,18,42,43 and 47-50 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,11,15,17,18,42,43 and 47-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendments, filed 9/20/2010, have been fully considered and reviewed by the examiner. The examiner notes the amendment to claim 1 and the addition of claims 47-50. Claims 1, 11, 15, 17-18, 42-43, and 47-50 are pending in the instant application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 4/2/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because they are directed to newly added claim limitations that were not present at the time of the prior rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 15, 17-18, 42-43, and 47-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a first reactive precursor of H₂O and a second reactive precursor of TMA , does not reasonably provide enablement for all arrangements of a first and second precursors as claimed. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The nature of the invention involves ALD reaction of a first and second reactive gases selected from a seemingly infinite number of gases and using a first reactive gas with a starved dose and a second reactive gas with a dose for achieving starved saturation under variations in dose resulting in less than half of a maximum saturated ALD growth rate, selecting the doses that will provide an maximum starved ALD process film deposition rate, all with the requirement of the providing a substantially uniform film deposition. The state of the prior art is silent to various precursor combinations capable of being utilized in such a manner and while the skill of one ordinary in the art is relatively high, the claims required a chemical reactions and evaluating dosing which is a highly exact science with little predictability. Additionally, while the specification clearly describes with sufficient specificity the application of the species of Water (first) and TMA (second) with or without purges are disclosed in having the results as claimed, the specification fails to include any working examples or direction as to a representative number of species of the seemingly infinite number of possible precursor combinations that would result a uniform film deposition as claimed without undue experimentation. This undue experimentation would encompass determining which first material has a longer saturation time, the doses required to meet the claim limitations and then which gases will provide the claimed deposition rate when used in combination according to the claim limitations. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The examiner cites here US Patent Publication 20070026540, which discloses supplying a under saturated dose of a precursor and a non-uniform film deposition (see abstract and 0014) and while this

evidence is not prior art, it supports the position that undue experimentation would result in forming a uniform film over the substrate surface when using a under saturated dose during ALD deposition.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. None of the prior art cited or reviewed by the examiner disclose or makes obvious the less than half dose of water as required by the claim in combination with TMA as supplied according to the claim limitations.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID TUROCY whose telephone number is (571)272-2940. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 7 a.m.-6 p.m., Tuesdays 7 a.m.-3:30 p.m. and Thursday 7-10 a.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David Turocy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792